

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 3-27 and 29-92 are in the application. Claims 1, 3-27 and 29-52 are currently pending. Claims 53-92 were previously withdrawn without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1 and 27 are independent and are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3-27, and 29-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,598,216 to Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,404,817 to Saha et al. (hereinafter merely “Saha”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,978,817 to Jung et al. (hereinafter merely “Jung”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 1, as amended, is illustrative and recites, *inter alia*:

“parsing said video/audio signals in a compressed domain of the video/audio signals and extracting therefrom motion vectors of said video/audio signals, DCT-coefficients and macroblock-type . . .” (Emphasis added).

The Office Action of June 6, 2006 points to Saha col. 10, lines 20-40 and FIG. 4 for this element. However, the amendment of claim 1 avoids Saha. As understood by Applicant, Saha retrieves compressed video data, which is then subjected to a decoder that parses the video data and performs decoding to extract the macroblock header information, the motion vector information, and the DCT coefficient information. The motion vector information is used to retrieve and combine the reference image block with the image correction block to produce a decoded image block. There is no suggestion in Saha that the motion vectors, DCT-coefficients and macroblock-type are extracted from the compressed video signal. In Saha the values are extracted from the decoded video signal.

In contrast, claim 1 recites, “parsing said video/audio signals in a compressed domain of the video/audio signals and extracting therefrom motion vectors of said video/audio signals, DCT-coefficients and macroblock-type.”

The supplied video/audio signal has image values (feature values) where there is useful information. The DCT of the supplied video/audio signal comprises DCT blocks each having a particular value derived from the supplied video/audio signal. Feature points are DCT blocks that satisfy the mathematical definition disclosed in the as-filed specification at page 24, line 9 to page 25, line 17.

The present application tracks feature blocks in the compressed (DCT) domain, not the real domain as disclosed in Lee, Saha and Jung. Thus, claim 1 recites, “parsing said video/audio signals in a compressed domain of the video/audio signals and extracting therefrom . . .” The

present application uses, for example, the already MPEG-compressed data to track feature points. The present application has the advantage of avoiding the step of looking for feature points in a far more heavily populated data space, that is, the real domain.

Claim 1 is patentable over Lee, Jung and Saha because neither of those references taken either alone or in combination teach or suggest each and every limitation recited in the claim. In particular, the references do not disclose, “parsing said video/audio signals in a compressed domain of the video/audio signals and extracting therefrom motion vectors of said video/audio signals, DCT-coefficients and macroblock-type” as recited in claim 1.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claim 27 is also believed to be patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

As stated above, the dependent claims depend from one of the claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1, 3-27, and 29-52 are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited

reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Paul A. Levy
Reg. No. 45,748
(212) 588-0800